

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/753,131	GALAI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lalita M. Hamilton	3691	

**All Participants:**

(1) Lalita M. Hamilton.

(2) Sam Borodach.

**Status of Application:** non-final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 15 November 2006
**Time:** 10:00 am
**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Rejection of independent claims 1, 15, and 25-26*

Claims discussed:

*1, 15, and 25-26*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Massey Jr. and Kaufman*

**Part II.**


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant about the new references (Kaufman and Massey). The Applicant described the differences between the Massey and Kaufman references and the Applicant's invention. The Applicant stated that in the Kaufman references, the movie company, which may be interpreted as being the artists, do not receive anything. The last step of the independent claims is not satisfied by Kaufman. With regard to the Massey reference, the Applicant stated that the investors may own shares, but does not have creative control, so they are not "artists"; no pools of works of art are present, just a single movie; investors are not receiving shares in exchange for works of art; and in the end, the investors receive a free copy of a movie, not portions of the revenues. The Examiner stated that she would review the arguments and determine allowability..

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized, overlapping loops and strokes, likely representing the initials or name of the examiner or applicant.